arXiv:1412.8016v2 [math.ST] 6 Apr 2015

SOME RESULTS ON CONTRACTION RATES FOR BAYESIAN INVERSE PROBLEMS

MADHURESH, SREEKAR VADLAMANI, AND AMIT APTE

Abstract. We prove a general lemma for deriving contraction rates for linear inverse problems with non parametric nonconjugate priors. We then apply it to Gaussian priors and obtain minimax rates in mildly ill-posed case. This includes, for example, Meyer wavelet basis with Gaussian priors in the *deconvolution problem*. The result for severely ill-posed problems is derived only when the prior is sufficiently smooth. The bases for which our method works is dense in the space of all bases in a sense which shall be described in this paper.

1. Introduction

Inverse problems can always be formulated as solutions of equations of the type $y = G(u)$ where y is known (typically some measurement or data from an experiment) and we need to solve the equation to find u [14, Chapter 1]. The model which we shall investigate here is the statistical version of infinite dimensional linear inverse problems of this type. Specifically, we assume that G is a linear, injective operator from Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1$ to Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_2$ (both infinite dimensional). We treat u as a random variable on $\mathcal{H}_1$ and define y by the following equation:

$$y = G(u) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\eta\,, \tag{1}$$

where η is a Gaussian noise on $\mathcal{H}_2$: $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \zeta)$.[1] In a Bayesian formulation of the problem, also known as nonparametric (parametric) Bayesian framework when u is infinite (finite) dimensional, we assume that u is distributed according to a measure μ_0 on $\mathcal{H}_1$, to be considered as the prior measure. We further assume that u and η are independent. Given the above assumptions, Bayes' theorem gives the distribution of the conditional random variable u given y, called the posterior distribution, to be denoted henceforth by μ_n^y. We will be interested in the properties of the posterior in the small-noise limit as $n \to \infty$.

In many practical applications, the inverse problem is ill-posed, in the sense that u may not exist for given y, or it may not be unique, or u may not depend continuously on y. In such cases, many methods of regularization are well developed for linear ill-posed inverse problems but are still being developed for many nonlinear problems, see, e.g. the book by Kirsch [14] and references therein. A related approach in dealing with ill-posed inverse problems is the statistical approach similar to the one introduced in the first paragraph. The statistical approach may turn a deterministic ill-posed inverse problem into a well-posed problem in the sense that, under very general assumptions on G, the posterior distribution μ_n^y for the conditional random variable u given y is continuous with respect to y even when G^{-1} is not continuous (see for e.g., the papers [20, 6] for details, further discussions and references).

Thus the main object of interest in the statistical version is this posterior distribution μ_n^y. Depending on the context, various properties and quantities related to the posterior distribution are of interest. A far from exhaustive list of recent studies includes credible sets of the posterior [15]; computational methods and finite

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 62Gxx .

Key words and phrases. Bayesian asymptotics.

This research work benefited from the support of the AIRBUS Group Corporate Foundation Chair in Mathematics of Complex Systems established in ICTS and CAM, TIFR, Bangalore. The authors would like to thanks Andrew Stuart for the initial discussions which motivated this work.

[1] We may choose η to be the white noise i.e. $\zeta = \mathcal{I}$. This makes the data space large, because the white noise is supported on a much bigger space than $\mathcal{H}_2$. We explain white noise in a little detail in section 2. Use of white noise is pretty common in literature.

dimensional approximations of equation (1) and of the posterior μ_n^y [13]; convergence of MAP (maximum a posteriori) and CM (conditional mean) estimators. For an extensive bibliography, one may refer to [11].

Another major question in the statistical version is that of consistency of the posterior measure. Depending on the formulation of the problem, one expects the posterior measure to approach Dirac delta supported on the true value of the unknown either as the number of observations goes to infinity (large data limit), or as the observations become more accurate (small noise limit). The first result in large data limit is due to Doob [18], and this limit has been investigated in many different contexts since then. There has been a recent interest in the small noise limit [19, 15, 3, 16]. Under certain conditions, these large data and small noise limits are equivalent [4]. Methods from the former (large data limit) are exploited in the work of Ray [19] to deal with small noise limits and will be used explicitly by us in this work as well.

We shall focus on the small noise limit. In particular, we will assume that the data is obtained from a "true" unknown element $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ in equation (1). We will be concerned with the rate of contraction of the Bayesian posterior distribution to the true solution u_0 in an appropriate way to be described later. Essentially we look for the posterior measure μ_n^y of the complements of small balls around u_0, that is, $\mu_n^y\{u : \|u - u_0\| > \xi_n\}$. Note that this is a random variable in y. We then study the convergence of this random variable to 0 as $n \to \infty$. In case we can prove such a convergence, ξ_n is called the contraction rate. Compared to the previous studies [19, 15, 3, 16, 2], we extend the class of priors and the class of distributions of data noise η for which we can obtain the contraction rates. The details of the technical assumptions needed for our results are contained in section 3 but a summary is contained towards the end of section 2.3.

In Section 2.1, we shall begin by presenting the basic set-up, followed in Section 2.2 by the precise definitions for consistency and contraction rates along with an example of contraction rate in finite dimensional linear inverse problems, the details of which are presented in the appendix. Our main results on contraction rates, Lemma 3.5, as well as Lemma 3.13 and Corollary 3.10, which are extensions of and use the methods from the work of Ray [19], are stated and proved in Section 3. In the last Section 4, we discuss three classes of examples where we can apply our results.

2. Consistency and contraction rates

In this paper, we investigate the question of consistency and contraction rates for Bayesian inverse problem that was outlined in Section 1, specifically in the small-noise case. Heuristically, consistency means how well the random posterior measure concentrates around the true solution as the observations get more precise by way of the observational noise converges to zero in an appropriate way.

In this section, we first introduce the basic setup and the Bayes' theorem in the context of our problem, followed by the definitions of consistency and contraction rates Section 2.2. We also discuss relation to previous work in detail in Section 2.3.

2.1. Basic setup.

As discussed in the introductory section 1, we will consider statistical versions of linear inverse problem, as given in the model in equation (1). We will treat u and y as random variables defined on an abstract probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, taking values in Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$, equipped with the inner products $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_1$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$ and corresponding norms $\| \cdot \|_1$ and $\| \cdot \|_2$, respectively. Here y is referred to as the observed data and u as the unknown or the parameter to be determined.

We will consider the operator $G : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_2$ to be linear and injective. Our first lemma will require that G have a singular value decomposition, i.e., the eigenvectors of $G^T G$ form a basis of $\mathcal{H}_1$ which we denote by $\{e_k\}$ with corresponding eigenvalues $\{\rho_k^2\}$, i.e., $G^T G e_k = \rho_k^2 e_k$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. We will consider ill-posed inverse problems in the sense that the inverse of G is discontinuous, i.e., 0 is a limit point of the eigenvalues ρ_k^2. Thus in this case, for any $y \in G(\mathcal{H}_1)$, there is a unique $u \in \mathcal{H}_1$ satisfying $y = G(u)$ but the dependence of u on y is not continuous. Two important cases of ill-posed inverse problems are as follows [19, 5].

- The inverse problem is called severely ill-posed if

$$C_1(1+k^2)^{-\alpha_1} e^{-2C_0 k^{-\beta}} \leq \rho_k \leq C_2(1+k^2)^{-\alpha_2} e^{-2C_0 k^{-\beta}} \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{2}$$

  Essentially in this case, the eigenvalues of $G^T G$ decay exponentially. An example is the classical inverse problem of determination of initial condition of the heat equation given the solution at a later time.

- The problem is called mildly ill-posed if

$$C_1(1+k^2)^{-\alpha/2} \leq \rho_k \leq C_2(1+k^2)^{-\alpha/2} \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{3}$$

We will consider the case of observational noise to be Gaussian, i.e., $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0,\zeta)$, on $\mathcal{H}_2$. We know that $\mathcal{N}(0,\zeta)$ is supported on $\mathcal{H}_2$ if and only if ζ is trace class, see [17]. However, covariance operators which are not trace class are also commonly used. For instance, the covariance of white noise is the identity which is clearly not trace class. Even in such a case, it is said that the noise on the space $\mathcal{H}_2$ is white, the noise is not actually supported on $\mathcal{H}_2$ but on a much larger space $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_2$ which we define below. Let $\{b_i\}$ be any orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_2$ and let R_i be the one dimensional span of b_i. Let ν_i be the standard Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ on R_i and define the white noise $\mathbb{W}$ on $\mathcal{H}_2$ to be the product measure of ν_i on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_2 := \prod R_i$. Even though the above definition uses the basis $\{b_i\}$, the measure $\mathbb{W}$ is independent of the choice of the basis $\{b_i\}$. In fact, if W is a random variable distributed as $\mathbb{W}$, we can check that $\mathrm{cov}(\langle W,x\rangle_2, \langle W,y\rangle_2) = \langle x,y\rangle_2$ (see [17]). In either case (whether ζ is trace class or not), we shall assume that $G(\mathcal{H}_1)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{H}_{2,\zeta}$, the Cameron-Martin space of the noise.

Denote by $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$ the measure of the noise $\eta/\sqrt{n}$ and by $\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}$ the measure of y given u, i.e., measure of the scaled noise $\eta/\sqrt{n}$ shifted by $G(u)$ for any fixed $u \in \mathcal{H}_1$. The above assumption that $G(u)$ belongs to the Cameron-Martin space of $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$ implies that $\mathbb{Q}_{u,n} \ll \mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$. Indeed, the Radon-Nikodym derivative is given by the Cameron-Martin theorem [17]:

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}}{d\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}} = \exp\left(-\Phi(y,u)\right), \tag{4}$$

where

$$\Phi(y,u) := \frac{n}{2}\langle G(u), G(u)\rangle_\zeta - n\langle y, G(u)\rangle_\zeta, \tag{5}$$

where $\langle x,y\rangle_\zeta = \langle \zeta^{-1/2}x, \zeta^{-1/2}y\rangle_2$ is the Cameron-Martin norm.

Following the Bayesian philosophy, we will assume u to be a $\mathcal{H}_1$ valued random variable that is independent of η. The distribution for u will be interpreted as the *prior* for u, and will be denoted by μ_0. We will be interested in the conditional distribution of u conditioned on y, as given by the Bayes' theorem. We shall now state the conditions under which the density of posterior distribution w.r.t the prior measure is well-defined. We will not require this condition for further discussion, but rather will only require the inequality (8) to be true for proving our results in Section 3.

Claim 2.1. *Assume that the random variable u is independent of the noise η. Further, assume that $\zeta^{-1/2}G(u) \in \mathcal{H}_2$ for all u. Then, the conditional distribution, denoted by μ_n^y, for the random variable $u|y$ is well-defined and also absolutely continuous with respect to the prior μ_0 for $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$-a.e. y. Indeed, the posterior measure of any Borel set $B \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$ is given by*

$$\mu_n^y(B) = \frac{1}{Z_n^y}\int_B \exp\left(-\Phi(y,u)\right) d\mu_0(u), \tag{6}$$

where $\Phi(y,u)$ is defined in equation (5) and the constant

$$Z_n^y := \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \exp\left(-\Phi(y,u)\right) d\mu_0(u) \tag{7}$$

is finite:

$$0 < Z_n^y < \infty. \tag{8}$$

Proof. Because of independence of u and η, the random variable (u,η) is distributed as $\mu_0 \otimes \mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$. Using equation (1) and the definition of $\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}$ above, we see that the distribution of the random variable (u,y) is $\mu_0 \otimes \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}$ and this measure is absolutely continuous w.r.t. $\mu_0 \otimes \mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$ with the same Radon-Nikodym derivative as in the RHS of equation (4). Thus by Bayes' theorem, the conditional distribution of u given y, denoted by μ_n^y, is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_0 with the same Radon-Nikodym derivative, which proves equation (6), as long as the constant Z_n^y is finite but non-zero.

We now show $0 < Z_n^y < \infty$ for $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$-a.e. y. It would suffice to show $0 < \int_S Z_n^y d\mathbb{Q}_{0,n} < \infty$ for all sets of positive measure S (under $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$).

$$\begin{aligned}\int_S Z_n^y d\mathbb{Q}_{0,n} &= \int_S \left(\int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \exp\left(-\Phi(y,u)\right) d\mu_0 \right) d\mathbb{Q}_{0,n} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \left(\int_S \exp\left(-\Phi(y,u)\right) d\mathbb{Q}_{0,n} \right) d\mu_0 \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{H}_1} \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(S) d\mu_0\end{aligned}$$

We have used Tonelli theorem and the change of variable formula for translation of Gaussian measures in the above. Since $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}$ are absolutely continuous with respect to each other for all u, we have $0 < \int \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(S) d\mu_0 < \infty$ and hence $0 < \int_S Z_n^y d\mathbb{Q}_{0,n} < \infty$. Therefore the posterior distribution exists and has the density given by equation (6). □

The above computation proves that the posterior μ_n^y is well defined for $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$ a.e. y. We also note here that the proof solely relies on the absolute continuity of the measures $\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$.

2.2. **Definition of contraction rates.** As discussed earlier, we are interested in the properties of the sequence of posteriors μ_n^y in the limit $n \to \infty$. In particular, we want to find if the posterior concentrates around the true solution as the noise gets smaller. We will denote a fixed element $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ to be the true solution of the inverse problem, i.e., the data is given by $y = G(u_0) + \eta/\sqrt{n}$ which is a random variable with the only randomness given by the scaled noise η. The main idea is to look for the posterior measure of complements of neighborhoods of the true solution. Hence, we will define $f_{n,\xi}^y := \mu_n^y\{\, u \mid \|u - u_0\| > \xi \,\}$ which is a random variable that is defined for each y in the support of $\mathbb{Q}_{u_o,n}$. The consistency of the statistical inverse problem is then defined by the convergence in probability of these random variables $f_{n,\xi}^y$.

Definition 2.2. *The sequence of posteriors μ_n^y is said to be consistent if $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\{\, y \mid f_{n,\xi}^y > \delta \,\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $\delta > 0$.*

In fact, the above convergence may be true even when we replace ξ with a sequence $\xi_n \to 0$, which essentially defines the contraction rate as follows.

Definition 2.3. *A sequence ξ_n is said to be a rate of contraction for the sequence of posterior measures μ_n^y if $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\{\, y \mid f_{n,\xi_n}^y > \delta \,\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $\delta > 0$.*

As a concrete example illustrating the concepts of consistency and contraction rates, we will discuss the finite dimensional case where $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are R^p and R^q, respectively, with $q \geq p$, and $G : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ is again linear and injective. Since G is a map between finite dimensional spaces, this makes G^{-1} continuous on the image of G. This is then sufficient to obtain a contraction rate of $\xi_n = \sqrt{(\log n)/n}$. An outline of the proof of this result is given in the appendix.

2.3. **Discussion and relation to previous work.** As we see in the example above, in the finite dimensional setup, a nondegenerate linear G ensures well-posedness of the inverse problem and makes the problem of finding contraction rates easy. The same clearly does not hold for infinite dimensional case, which has received considerable attention only recently. We shall now outline some of these studies of contraction rates in infinite dimensions, pointing out the relations to our main result.

In the two papers [15] and [3], the authors deal with mildly ill-posed [see equation (3)] and severely ill-posed [see equation (2)] inverse problems, respectively. Both these studies assume Gaussian priors and white noise. They first calculate the mean and covariance operator of the posterior distribution (which is Gaussian as well) and find a bound for $f_{n\xi}^y$ defined above, using Markov inequality and then take the expectation of the resulting random variable. At this point, they use the assumption that $\varphi_k = e_k$ where $\{\varphi_k\}$ is basis on which the prior is diagonal and recall that $\{e_k\}$ is the eigenbasis of $G^T G$. Using this assumption, they show that the expectation of $f_{n,\xi}^y$ equals the sum of a series and the estimate for the value of the sum provides the contraction rate.

In the paper [2], the authors again work with Gaussian priors, but with observational noise which may not necessarily be a white noise, generalizing some recent results [7, 8, 15, 16]. They work with the explicit expressions for the mean and covariance of the Gaussian posterior, obtaining contraction rates for mildly ill-posed problems. Further, in this setup, G may not have a SVD.

Remark 2.4. *The paper* [2] *uses the Hilbert scale (defined in section 3 of* [2]*) and their results require that the true solution u_0 belongs to the Cameron-Martin space of the prior distribution μ_0, specifically, $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\gamma$ for $\gamma \geq 1$. But our main results in lemmas 3.5 and 3.13 can be applied even in case when $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\gamma$ for any $\gamma > 0$.*

The paper [19] contains a discussion of cases where the prior may not be Gaussian and we shall be using methods used in that paper. The main idea in that paper [19] is to use test functions as introduced in some earlier works [9]. (Similar test functions are defined later in our paper in proposition 3.7.) A key result, Theorem 2.1, in [19] is along the lines of similar results in [10], and is proved under the assumption that the set $\{l \mid \langle \varphi_k, e_l \rangle_1 \neq 0\}$ is finite for each k, where $\{\varphi_k\}$ is an arbitrary basis of $\mathcal{H}_1$. When considering Gaussian priors, the conditions required for the main Theorem 2.1 in [19] imply further restriction that $\varphi_k = e_k$, which is also the case discussed in [15, 3, 2].

The main contribution of this paper is in generalizing the conditions on the prior and the data noise under which we prove the contraction rates of the posterior. The first main assumptions 3.1 that we use simply says that the prior puts enough probability mass around the true value. For the other two main assumptions, we state three different versions, giving us three different versions of the contraction lemma.

- The first version (Assumptions 3.2-3.4) requires that elements in $\mathcal{H}_1$ are well approximated by projections onto finite dimensional spaces spanned by the basis $\{e_k\}$ (of eigenvalues of G^TG) and an arbitrary basis $\{\varphi_k\}$ (which, e.g., could be the a basis associated to the prior in some way), and that
$$\max_{\substack{\|h\|_1=1 \\ h \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_{k_n}\}}} \|\zeta^{1/2} \left(G^{-1}\right)^T P^e_{r_n} h\|^2 < \left(C_1 \frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n}\right)^2,$$
for appropriate sequences $k_n, r_n \to \infty$ and $\epsilon_n, \xi_n \to 0$, using which we prove, in Lemma 3.5, that ξ_n is the contraction rate.
- The second version (Assumptions 3.8-3.9 for Corollary 3.10) is a slight modification of the above as we take the "second" basis $\{\varphi_k\}$ to be the same as $\{e_k\}$ and require that
$$\frac{1}{\rho_k^2} < \left(C_1 \frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n}\right)^2,$$
where recall that ρ_k^2 are eigenvalues of G^TG.
- The third version (Assumptions 3.11-3.12 for Lemma 3.13) is also a modification of the first version with $r_n = \infty$, i.e., the finite dimensional projections are now only on the spaces spanned by the basis $\{\varphi_k\}$ and we assume that
$$\max_{\substack{\|h\|_1=1 \\ h \in \text{span}\{\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_{k_n}\}}} \|\zeta^{1/2} \left(G^{-1}\right)^T h\|^2 < \left(C_1 \frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n}\right)^2,$$

The proofs of these three versions are very similar (though that of the second version is the easiest), hence we only present the proof of the first version in detail, indicating how to prove the other versions. The main reason why these three sets of assumptions could be useful is that in specific examples, one or the other set may be easy to verify, as we will see in Section 4. In particular, all the examples discussed in Section 4 use Gaussian prior, and for such priors, verifying the third set, i.e., Assumptions 3.11-3.12, is much easier by choosing $\{\varphi_k\}$ to be the basis in which the prior is diagonal.

3. Contraction Lemma

We shall now present our main results, namely, two closely related contraction lemmas and a corollary. They will aid us in finding the contraction rates if the prior satisfies certain conditions (in relation with the linear operator G). Each lemma demands different conditions, which are closely related to one another. Depending on the kind of prior, one may find it easier or difficult to verify some of these conditions and

this may dictate which form of the lemma to use. We shall present the proof only for the first contraction lemma, and outline the proof of the corollary and the second lemma.

As described in Section 2.2, contraction rate for a posterior measure is a way of quantifying concentration of the posterior measure around the true value. However, the concentration phenomenon does not happen if the prior distribution does not put enough probability mass around the true value. This can be avoided with the following assumption:

Assumption 3.1. *Assume that there exist a sequence of real numbers $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\epsilon_n \to 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2 \to \infty$, such that*

$$\mu_0\{u : \|G(u) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta \leq \epsilon_n\} \geq e^{-Cn\epsilon_n^2} \qquad \text{for some } C > 0. \tag{9}$$

Note that the norm above is the Cameron-Martin norm of the noise measure.

Additionally, we also need to ensure that, with high probability (under the prior measure), elements in $\mathcal{H}_1$ are well approximated by the finite dimensional projections. This is made precise in the following.

Assumption 3.2. *Assume that G has an SVD and G^TG has the eigenpair $\{e_k, \rho_k^2\}$. Further, assume that there exists a sequence of real constants $\xi_n > 0$, sequences of positive integers k_n, r_n and a basis $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ of $\mathcal{H}_1$ satisfying*

- *$r_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$;*
- *$k_n < Rn\epsilon_n^2$ for some $R > 0$, where ϵ_n is as defined in the previous assumption;*
- *$\max\{\xi_n, k_n^{-1}\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and*
- *writing $P^{\varphi}_{k_n}$ and $P^{e}_{r_n}$ as the projections onto the subspace spanned by $\{\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{k_n}\}$ and $\{e_1, \ldots, e_{r_n}\}$ respectively, we need*

$$\mu_0\{u : \left\|P^{\varphi}_{k_n} P^{e}_{r_n}(u) - u\right\|_1 > C_2\xi_n\} \leq e^{-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2} \tag{10}$$

for some $C_2 > 0$.

Remark 3.3. *Note that a sufficient condition to check inequality (10) is that*

$$\mu_0\left\{u : \left\|P^{\varphi}_{k_n}(u) - u\right\|_1 > \frac{C_2}{2}\xi_n\right\} \leq \frac{1}{2}e^{-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2} \tag{11}$$

and

$$\mu_0\left\{u : \left\|P^{\varphi}_{k_n}\left[P^{e}_{r_n}(u) - u\right]\right\|_1 > \frac{C_2}{2}\xi_n\right\} \leq \frac{1}{2}e^{-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2}. \tag{12}$$

Next is a technical assumption which underlines the relationship between the eigenbasis of G^TG and the basis $\{\varphi_k\}$.

Assumption 3.4. *Let $S \equiv (G^{-1})^T$, then define*

$$g_{k,r} := \max_{\substack{\|h\|_1=1 \\ h\in span\{\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_k\}}} \|\zeta^{1/2} S P^{e}_{r} h\|_2^2. \tag{13}$$

We assume that $\sqrt{g_{k_n,r_n}} \leq C_1\frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n}$. Note that $g_{k,r}$ is finite whenever k and r are finite.

In summary, the choice of a prior μ_0 and the operator G will determine the sequence $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in Assumption 3.1. Thereafter, $\{\epsilon_n\}$ along with G and μ_0 will dictate the existence of $\{k_n\}$, $\{r_n\}$ and $\{\xi_n\}$ in Assumptions 3.2 and 3.4. Finally, equipped with the above sequences, we shall see in the following lemma that ξ_n, defined earlier, is the rate of contraction of the posterior measure μ_n^y defined in equation (6).

Lemma 3.5 (Contraction Lemma)**.** *Consider the model given by equation (1), together with Assumptions 3.1-3.4 stated above. Also, let u_0 be such that $\left\|P^{\varphi}_{k_n} P^{e}_{r_n}(u_0) - u_0\right\|_1 = O(\xi_n)$. Then,*

$$\mu_n^y(u : \|u - u_0\|_1 > M\xi_n) \to 0 \quad \text{in probability,} \tag{14}$$

where, recall that, ξ_n is called the rate of contraction of the posterior measure μ_n^y around the true value u_0.

Remark 3.6. *Clearly, Assumption 3.4 does not place any* a priori *restrictions on the basis of the prior as in previous works (see [19]). We also note here that, at this stage we do not know if Assumption 3.2 can be verified for a given problem when r_n is finite. However, in our next lemma we shall weaken Assumption 3.2 by setting $r_n = \infty$.*

We shall prove the above lemma in an indirect way which follows the work of Ghosal et. al. [9], where the authors established a close relation between contraction rates and existence of sequence of *tests*, which are real valued functions $\{\psi_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ defined on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_2$ and satisfying certain regularity conditions, which in turn translate into contraction rates. More precisely, we shall use the following proposition.

Proposition 3.7. *Let there exist* **tests** $\psi_n : \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ *for $n \geq 1$, satisfying*

$$\sup_{\{u\in\mathcal{H}_1 : \|P_{k_n,r_n}(u)-u\|_1 \leq C_2\xi_n, \|u-u_0\|_1 \geq M\xi_n\}} \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(1-\psi_n) \leq e^{-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2} \tag{15}$$

$$\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}(\psi_n) \to 0, \tag{16}$$

then ξ_n is the contraction rate of the posterior measure μ_n^y around the true value u_0.

In view of the above proposition, which will be proved later, the proof of Lemma 3.5 proceeds as follows: under Assumptions 3.1-3.4, we show that the same tests ψ_n as were used in the work of Ray [19] satisfy conditions (15) and (16) above.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Recall the model $y = G(u) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\eta$. We will define

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{k,r} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\langle \varphi_k, e_i\rangle}{\rho_i^2} G e_i \triangleq S P_r^e \varphi_k.$$

Then, setting $\tilde{y}_{k,r}$ as the projection of y onto $\tilde{\varphi}_{k,r}$, we can write

$$\tilde{y}_{k,r} = \langle \tilde{\varphi}_{k,r}, G(u)\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\tilde{\eta}_{k,r} = \langle u, P_r^e \varphi_k\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\tilde{\eta}_{k,r},$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_{k,r} = \langle \eta, \tilde{\varphi}_{k,r}\rangle$. Thereafter, we define

$$\hat{u}_n = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \tilde{y}_{k,r_n}\varphi_k$$

Clearly, $\hat{u}_n = P_{k_n}^{\varphi} P_{r_n}^e u + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\tilde{\eta}_{k,r_n}$. Then we define the tests as

$$\psi_n(y) = 1_{\{\|\hat{u}_n - u_0\|_1 \geq M_0\xi_n\}}, \tag{17}$$

where M_0 is some non-negative constant to be identified later.

In order to prove that the proposed tests satisfy conditions (15) and (16) we shall begin by estimating the distribution of $\hat{u}_n$ around its mean. To this end, using the separability of $\mathcal{H}_1$ and the Hahn-Banach theorem, there exists a dense subset B_1 of a unit ball in $\mathcal{H}_1$ such that for every element $v \in \mathcal{H}_1$,

$$\|v\|_1 = \sup_{w\in B_1} |\langle v, w\rangle_1|$$

Interpreting the norm as the supremum over a dense set as above, and using the Borell-TIS inequality [1, Theorem 2.1.1] we get,

$$\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\|\hat{u}_n - \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(\hat{u}_n)\|_1 - \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\|\hat{u}_n - \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(\hat{u}_n)\|_1\right) \geq x\right) \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_0^2}}, \quad \forall x > 0 \tag{18}$$

where σ_0 is given as

$$\sigma_0^2 = \sup_{h\in B_1} \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \tilde{Z}_{k,r_n}\langle h, \varphi_k\rangle_1\right)^2 \triangleq \sup_{h\in B_0} \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(K(h)^2\right). \tag{19}$$

In order to get appropriate estimates on $\hat{u}_n$, we need to now estimate σ_0 and $\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\|\hat{u}_n - \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(\hat{u}_n)\|_1\right)$. Notice that by Jensen's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\|\hat{u}_n - \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(\hat{u}_n)\|_1\right)\right]^2 &\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_n}\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\tilde{Z}^2_{k,r_n}\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_n}\left\|\zeta^{1/2}\tilde{\varphi}_{k,r_n}\right\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_n}\left\|\zeta^{1/2}SP^e_{r_n}\varphi_k\right\|_2^2\end{aligned}$$

Then, recalling the definition of g_n from Assumption 3.4, we have

$$\left[\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\|\hat{u}_n - \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(\hat{u}_n)\|_1\right)\right]^2 \leq \frac{k_n}{n}\left[\max_{\substack{\|h\|_1=1\\ h\in\mathrm{span}\{\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_{k_n}\}}}\left\|\zeta^{1/2}SP^e_{r_n}h\right\|^2\right] = \frac{k_n}{n}g_{k_n,r_n} \tag{20}$$

Thereafter, to estimate σ_0^2, we start with the following

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(K(h)^2\right) &= \frac{1}{n}\left\langle Z, \sum_{k=1}^{k_n}\langle h,\varphi_k\rangle\,\tilde{\varphi}_{k,r_n}\right\rangle_2^2\\ &= \frac{1}{n}\left\|\zeta^{1/2}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_n}\langle h,\varphi_k\rangle\,\tilde{\varphi}_{k,r_n}\right)\right\|_2^2\\ &= \frac{1}{n}\left\|\zeta^{1/2}SP^e_{r_n}P^{\varphi}_{k_n}(h)\right\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, equation (19) can be restated as

$$\sigma_0^2 = \sup_{h\in B_0}\frac{1}{n}\left\|\zeta^{1/2}SP^e_{r_n}P^{\varphi}_{k_n}(h)\right\|_2^2 = \frac{g_{k_n,r_n}}{n} \tag{21}$$

Substituting the conclusions of equations (20) and (21) in the inequality (18) and choosing $x^2 = 2L\epsilon_n^2 g_{k_n,r_n}$, we get

$$\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left(\|\hat{u}_n - \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}(\hat{u}_n)\|_1 \geq M\epsilon_n\sqrt{g_{k_n,r_n}}\right) \leq \exp(-Ln\epsilon_n^2), \tag{22}$$

which is analogous to equation 4.2 in [19] with $\sqrt{g_{k_n,r_n}}$ replacing $1/\delta_{k_n}$. Notice that the above estimate does not depend on u, which is not coincidental but a simple consequence of Gaussian computation.

Using the above estimate and following the Proof of Theorem 2.1 in [19], almost line by line, we can prove that the proposed tests satisfy the conditions (15) and (16), which together with Proposition 3.7 proves the contraction lemma. □

Next, we shall prove Proposition 3.7. It is easy to see that both the numerator as well as the denominator in equation (6) for the posterior measure of a set will converge to 0 as $n\to\infty$. Therefore, in order to extract the exact rate, we shall analyse the numerator and denominator separately.

Proof of Proposition 3.7. As before, writing $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}$ as expectation with respect to the noise measure shifted by $G(u_0)$, notice that for any Borel subset B of $\mathcal{H}_1$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left(\mu_n^y(B)\psi_n\right) \leq \mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\psi_n \to 0 \qquad \text{by condition (16).}$$

Multiplying the numerator and denominator of equation (6) with a constant $\exp\left(\frac{n\|G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2} - n\langle G(u_0), y\rangle_\zeta\right)$ that depends on u_0 but is independent of u, allows us to write the posterior measure as

$$\mu_n^y(B) = \frac{1}{Z_{u_0}}\int_B \exp\left(-\frac{n\|G(u)\|_\zeta^2}{2} + \frac{n\|G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2} + n\langle G(u-u_0), y\rangle_\zeta\right)d\mu_0(u)\,.$$

Note that the above algebraic manipulation can be done for a.e.-y (under the noise measure). Next, denoting $W_n^y(B)$ as the numerator of $\mu_n^y(B)$ above, we now estimate $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left[(1-\psi_n)W_n^y(B)\right]$. Applying Fubini theorem we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left(\int_B (1-\psi_n)\exp\left(-\frac{n\|G(u)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+\frac{n\|G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+n\left\langle G(u-u_0),y\right\rangle_\zeta\right)d\mu_0\right)\\
&=\int_B \mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left((1-\psi_n)\exp\left(-\frac{n\|G(u)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+\frac{n\|G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+n\left\langle G(u-u_0),y\right\rangle_\zeta\right)\right)d\mu_0\\
&=\int_B \mathbb{Q}_{u,n}\left((1-\psi_n)\right)d\mu_0\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Gaussian change of measure formula relating $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{u,n}$ to get the last line. Then collating all the above and taking $B=\{u\in\mathcal{H}_1:\|P_{k_n}(u)-u\|_1\le C_2\xi_n,\|u-u_0\|_1\ge M\xi_n\}$ to be the set that appears in inequality (15), we get

$$\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left[(1-\psi_n)W_n^y(B)\right]\le\exp\left(-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2\right).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left((1-\psi_n)W_n^y(\{u:\|u-u_0\|_1\ge M\xi_n\})\right)\\
&\le\exp\left(-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2\right)+\mu_0\{\|P_{k_n}(u)-u\|_1>C_2\xi_n\}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we analyse the denominator of equation (6). Let $D=\{u:\|G(u)-G(u_0)\|_\zeta\le\epsilon_n\}$, and ν be a probability measure on D. We shall try to estimate the integrand (in the denominator) on this set D. To start with, we see that

$$-\frac{\|G(u)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+\frac{\|G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+\langle G(u-u_0),y\rangle_\zeta=-\frac{\|G(u-u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+\langle G(u-u_0),y-G(u_0)\rangle_\zeta$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left(\int_D(-\frac{\|G(u-u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+\langle G(u-u_0),y-G(u_0)\rangle_\zeta)d\nu\le-(1+C)\epsilon_n^2\right)\\
&\le\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left(\int_D(\langle G(u-u_0),y-G(u_0)\rangle_\zeta)d\nu\le-(1/2+C)\epsilon_n^2\right)\\
&=\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left(\int_D(\langle G(u-u_0),Z\rangle_\zeta)d\nu\le-(1/2+C)\epsilon_n^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using Chebyshev's and Jensen's inequalities successively, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left(\int_D(\langle G(u-u_0),Z\rangle)d\nu\le-(1/2+C)\epsilon_n^2\right)\\
&\le\frac{\int_D\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}\left\langle Z,G(u-u_0)\right\rangle_\zeta^2\,d\nu}{(-(1/2+C)\epsilon_n^2)^2}\le\frac{\epsilon_n^2}{n(-(1/2+C)\epsilon_n^2)^2}\\
&\le K\,\left(n\epsilon_n^2\right)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

for some $K>0$. Next, let us define

$$S_n=\left\{y:\int_D\left(-\frac{\|G(u-u_0)\|_\zeta^2}{2}+\langle G(u-u_0),y\rangle_\zeta\right)d\nu\ge-(1+C)\epsilon_n^2\right\},$$

and note that $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}(S_n)\to1$.

It is easy to see that the numerator and the denominator of $\mu_n^y(\{u:\|u-u_0\|_1\ge M\xi_n\})(1-\psi_n)$ converge in probability (w.r.t. $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}$) to 0 at rates $\exp\left(-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2\right)$ and $\exp\left(-(C+2)n\epsilon_n^2\right)$, respectively. This implies that $\mu_n^y(\{u:\|u-u_0\|_1\ge M\xi_n\})$ converges in probability (w.r.t. $\mathbb{Q}_{u_0,n}$) to 0. □

Notice that we could have replaced μ_0 by $\mu_{0,n}$ and the proof above would still work. In this paper, we shall be using μ_0 independent of n.

3.1. **A corollary with restrictive assumptions.** We now note that the admission of the basis $\{\varphi_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ seems ad hoc. If we take $\varphi_k = e_k$, then the proof is a lot simpler. For example, we start by defining $\tilde{e}_k$ in place of $\tilde{\varphi_k}$. Clearly, $\tilde{e}_k$ are orthogonal, which simplifies the proof. For the sake of clarity, we state the modified conditions that need to be checked. Assumption 3.1 remains exactly the same, and instead of 3.2, we have the following modified assumption.

Assumption 3.8. *Assume that G admits a singular value decomposition, and G^TG has the eigenpair $\{e_k, \rho_k^2\}$. Further, assume that there exist constants ξ_n, sequences of positive integers k_n*

- *$k_n < Rn\epsilon_n^2$ for some $R > 0$ and ϵ_n as in the previous assumption;*
- *$\max\{\xi_n, k_n^{-1}\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and*
- *writing $P^e_{k_n}$ as the projection onto the subspace spanned by $\{e_1, \ldots, e_{k_n}\}$, we need*

$$\mu_0\{u : \left\|P^e_{k_n}(u) - u\right\|_1 > C_2\xi_n\} \leq e^{-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2} \tag{23}$$

Further, Assumption 3.4 is replaced by

Assumption 3.9. $1/\rho_{k_n} \leq C_1\frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n}$.

Corollary 3.10. *Consider the model given by (1), together with Assumptions 3.1,3.8,3.9 stated above. Also, let u_0 be such that $\left\|P^e_{k_n}(u_0) - u_0\right\|_1 = O(\xi_n)$ then,*

$$\mu_n^y(u : \|u - u_0\|_1 > M\xi_n) \to 0 \quad \textit{in probability,} \tag{24}$$

The structure of conditions for the corollary is much simpler and the proof of the corollary is a much simplified version of the proof of lemma 3.5 (and hence the proof is omitted). But Assumption 3.8 does not have the flexibility of Assumption 3.2. The prior usually comes oriented along certain axes and it is far easier to get estimates on tail cylinder sets along those axes as compared to other axes (which is the case with the above corollary if the prior is oriented along some axes other than $\{e_k\}$). Introducing another basis allows us the flexibility to choose $\{\varphi_k\}$ to be oriented along the prior.

3.2. **Another version of the lemma.** In lemma 3.5, we needed to get estimates for prior measure along $\{e_k\}$ only on k_n dimensional subspaces along the prior oriented axes. In case it is difficult to get those estimates too, we need certain conditions on $\{\varphi_k\}$ with respect to G to help us get rid of estimating any tail cylinder sets along axes other than what the prior is oriented along. We can check that it can be done if we can set $r_n = \infty$ without any technical difficulty. This leads us to the assumptions of our next lemma. Note that as a benefit of setting $r_n = \infty$, we do not need G to have a singular value decomposition in this lemma. We now state new the set assumptions.

Again, Assumption 3.1 stays the same, and in lieu of Assumption 3.2, we have the following assumption.

Assumption 3.11. *Assume that there exist constants ξ_n, sequences of positive integers k_n, and a basis $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ of $\mathcal{H}_1$ satisfying*

- *$k_n < Rn\epsilon_n^2$ for some $R > 0$ and ϵ_n as in the previous assumption;*
- *$\max\{\xi_n, k_n^{-1}\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and*
- *writing P_{k_n} as the projection onto the subspace spanned by $\{\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{k_n}\}$, we need*

$$\mu_0\{u : \|P_{k_n}(u) - u\|_1 > C_2\xi_n\} \leq e^{-(C+4)n\epsilon_n^2} \tag{25}$$

Further, instead of assumption 3.4, we have

Assumption 3.12. *Define g_k by*

$$g_k := \max_{\substack{\|h\|_1=1 \\ h\in span\{\varphi_1,\ldots,\varphi_k\}}} \|\zeta^{1/2}Sh\|_2^2. \tag{26}$$

Finiteness of g_k can be guaranteed by imposing the condition that $\zeta^{1/2}S\varphi_j \in \mathcal{H}_2$ for all j. We assume that $\sqrt{g_{k_n}} \leq C_1\frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n}$.

With these assumptions, we state our second lemma.

Lemma 3.13. *Consider the model given by (1), together with assumptions 3.1,3.11,3.12 stated above. Also, let u_0 be such that $\left\|P^{\varphi}_{k_n}(u_0) - u_0\right\|_1 = O(\xi_n)$ then,*

$$\mu^y_n(u : \|u - u_0\|_1 > M\xi_n) \to 0 \quad \text{in probability,} \tag{27}$$

Again, the proof of this version of the lemma proceeds along the lines of the proof presented above using test functions, hence we do not present the details. We note that it is this lemma that we shall be using in the examples below.

4. Examples: Gaussian priors

The examples we shall be discussing in this section fit into the setup of Lemma 3.13. Notice that the requirement $\epsilon_n\sqrt{g_{k_n}} < C_1\xi_n$ is one of the main constraints in application of the above lemma. Depending on the prior, this condition dictates the kind of leeway we can get with the basis, on which the prior is defined. Further, the conditions in the lemma that we need to verify may also demand certain further relations between various bases. We shall show the details for the mildly ill posed case (3). The severely ill posed case (2) can be dealt with in exactly the same way whenever the prior is sufficiently smooth. The recipe to obtain the contraction rates involves following steps: first, we shall provide a method to find appropriate $\{\epsilon_n\}$ which satisfy Assumption 3.1; then, we find appropriate k_n and ξ_n satisfying Assumption 3.11; thereafter, we check if we have appropriate g_n which satisfy Assumption 3.12.

We begin by estimating a lower bound for $\mu_0\{u : \|G(u) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta \leq \epsilon\}$ and hence getting appropriate $\{\epsilon_n\}$. Clearly, estimating the above probability is a difficult task whenever the operators involved in the computation have different eigenbases. The examples we consider in this section would be such that estimating the the lower bound for the above probability is equivalent to estimating the lower bound for $\mu'_0\{u : \|G(u) - G(u_0)\|_{\zeta'} \leq \epsilon\}$ for some appropriate μ'_0 and ζ' which are diagonalisable in the eigenbasis of G^TG and GG^T, respectively. The latter is also called the diagonal case, and the estimates for this case are already known, see [19, Section 3.2].

We note here that the choice of μ'_0 and ζ' depends a lot on the problem at hand, however, given μ'_0 and ζ' we can check whether they satisfy the above requirement. First, we push μ_0 and μ'_0 via the maps $\zeta^{-1/2}G$ and $\zeta'^{-1/2}G'$, respectively. We denote the new measures as ν and ν' with covariance operators $\mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{T}'$ and eigenvalues $\{\alpha_j\}$, $\{\beta_j\}$ respectively. In either case, we need to calculate $\phi(\nu, u_0, \epsilon) \equiv \log\left(\nu\{y : \|y - G(u_0)\| \leq \epsilon\}\right)$. Similarly, define $\phi(\nu', u_0, \epsilon)$ for ν'. We know that

$$\phi(\nu, u_0, \epsilon) \geq \phi(\nu, 0, \epsilon/2) - \mathcal{K}(\nu, u_0, \epsilon) \tag{28}$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}(\nu, \zeta, u_0, \epsilon) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{H}_2 \| y - G(u_0)\|_\zeta \leq \epsilon/2} \|y\|_\nu.$$

We know that if $C_1\alpha_j \leq \beta_j \leq C_2\alpha_j$ for some $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$, then

$$C_3\phi(\nu, 0, \epsilon) \leq \phi(\nu', 0, \epsilon) \leq C_4\phi(\nu, 0, \epsilon) \tag{29}$$

for some $C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$, see [12]. Next, in order to estimate the upper bound for $\mathcal{K}(\nu, \zeta, u_0, \epsilon) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{H}_2 \| y - G(u_0)\|_\zeta \leq \epsilon/2} \|y\|_\nu$, we shall define Hilbert scales as below: u is said to belong in Hilbert scale of order γ for the self adjoint positive definite operator K denoted by $\mathcal{H}^\gamma_1(K)$ whenever $\sum_i \left(\frac{\langle u, v_i\rangle_1}{i^\gamma}\right)^2 < \infty$ where $\{v_j\}$ is the eigenbasis of K. Then, we shall show that for $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\gamma_1(\mathcal{T})$, there exists $u'_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\gamma'}_1(\mathcal{T}')$ for some $\gamma' > 0$ such that the estimate for $\mathcal{K}(\nu, \zeta, u_0, \epsilon)$ is the same as that for $\mathcal{K}(\nu', \zeta', u'_0, \epsilon)$, which together with equation (29) ensures the asymptotic equivalence of $\phi(\nu, u_0, \epsilon)$ and $\phi(\nu', u'_0, \epsilon)$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Thus the following assumption ensures that we get the same ϵ_n for the problem with (μ_0, u_0, G, ζ) and the problem with $(\mu'_0, u'_0, G, \zeta')$, the latter being the diagonal case for which the rates are known.

Assumption 4.1.

- *There exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that $C_1\alpha_j \leq \beta_j \leq C_2\alpha_j$.*
- *For $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\gamma_1(\mathcal{T})$, there exists $u'_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\gamma_1(\mathcal{T}')$ such that the estimate for $\mathcal{K}(\nu, \zeta, u_0, \epsilon)$ is the same as estimate for $\mathcal{K}(\nu', \zeta', u'_0, \epsilon)$.*

Before we start with explicit examples, we state a form of *min-max* theorem which we shall be using in the examples.

Theorem 4.2 (Min-max Theorem). *Assume $\mathcal{L}$ is a compact, self adjoint and positive definite operator on some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Let its eigenvalues be α_j and $\alpha_j \geq \alpha_{j+1}$. Then the following equalities hold*

- $\alpha_j = \max_{\{S:dim(S)=j\}} \min_{\{x:\|x\|=1, x\in S\}} \langle \mathcal{L}x, x\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$
- $\alpha_j = \min_{\{S:codim(S)=j-1\}} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1, x\in S\}} \langle \mathcal{L}x, x\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$
- $\frac{1}{\alpha_j} = \max_{\{S:codim(S)=j-1\}} \min_{\{x:\|x\|=1, x\in S\}} \langle \mathcal{L}^{-1}x, x\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$
- $\frac{1}{\alpha_j} = \min_{\{S:dim(S)=j\}} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1, x\in S\}} \langle \mathcal{L}^{-1}x, x\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$

Example 4.3 (Deconvolution for Meyer wavelets). *We consider the noise to be white. We shall assume that the problem is mildly illposed (3) with some exponent α. We skip the definition of Meyer wavelets here and refer the reader to [19] and the references therein for detailed exposition of Meyer wavelets. We simply need the following facts related to the Meyer wavelets: let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be the Meyer wavelet basis and $\{e_j\}$ be eigenbasis of G^TG (which is the Fourier basis in case of the deconvolution problem), then we have $\langle \varphi_j, e_k\rangle_1 = 0$ if $k \notin [j/3-1, 2j]$. It then immediately follows that*

$$g_n \leq (2n)^{2\alpha}. \tag{30}$$

Assume that the prior μ_0 is Gaussian with covariance operator $\mathcal{C}$ and eigenpair $\{\varphi_j, \lambda_j\}$. We then choose μ_0' to be Gaussian with covariance operator $\mathcal{C}'$ and eigenpair $\{e_j, \lambda_j\}$.

This makes ν and ν' Gaussian measures on $\mathcal{H}_2$ whose covariance operators are $G\mathcal{C}G^T$ and $G\mathcal{C}'G^T$ with eigenvalues $\{\alpha_j\}$ and $\{\beta_j\}$ respectively. We now verify Assumption 4.1. For the sake of brevity, let us define D_j^1 to be the span of $\{e_1, e_2 ..... e_j\}$ and D_j^2 to be $\{Ge_1, Ge_2 ..... Ge_j\}$. Now, to get the eigenvalues of $G\mathcal{C}G^T$, we apply the Min-max Theorem 4.2

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_j &= \sup_{C:C\subset\mathcal{H}_2, dimC=j} \inf_{x:x\in C} \frac{\langle G\mathcal{C}G^Tx, x\rangle_2}{\langle x, x\rangle_2} \\
&\geq \inf_{x\in D_j^2} \frac{\langle \mathcal{C}G^Tx, G^Tx\rangle_1}{\langle G^Tx, G^Tx\rangle_1} \frac{\langle GG^Tx, x\rangle_2}{\langle x, x\rangle_2} \\
&\geq \rho_j^2 \inf_{x\in D_j^2} \frac{\langle \mathcal{C}G^Tx, G^Tx\rangle_1}{\langle G^Tx, G^Tx\rangle_1} \\
&= \rho_j^2 \inf_{x\in D_j^1, ||x||=1} \langle \mathcal{C}x, x\rangle_1
\end{aligned}$$

For $x \in D_j^1$, let $x = \sum x_k\varphi_k$. Then, we have $x_k = 0$ for $k > 2j$, since $\langle \varphi_j, e_k\rangle_1 = 0$ if $k \notin [j/3-1, 2j]$. This implies

$$\inf_{x\in D_j^1, ||x||=1} \langle \mathcal{C}x, x\rangle_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{2j} \lambda_k x_k^2 \geq \lambda_{2j}$$

Hence, we have $\alpha_j \geq \rho_j^2\lambda_{2j} \geq C_1\rho_j^2\lambda_j = C_1\beta_j$. In an exactly similar fashion, we can show that $\alpha_j \leq C_2\rho_j^2\lambda_j$ by using the other half of the min-max principle.

We now deal with the second part of Assumption 4.1. Assume $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_1^\gamma(\mathcal{C})$ and let $\sum_i \left(\frac{\langle u_0, \varphi_i\rangle}{i^\gamma}\right)^2 = R$.

Let $u_0 = \sum_i u_{0,i}\varphi_i$, then we take $h = \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} u_{0,i}G(\varphi_i)$ for $j_0 \approx \epsilon^{-1/(\alpha+\gamma)}$.

Notice that

$$\|h\|_\nu = \left\langle (G\mathcal{C}G^T)^{-1/2}h, (G\mathcal{C}G^T)^{-1/2}h \right\rangle_2 = \left\langle (G\mathcal{C}G^T)^{-1}h, h\right\rangle_2 = \left\langle \mathcal{C}^{-1}G^{-1}h, G^{-1}h\right\rangle_2,$$

implying

$$\|h\|_\nu = \left\langle \mathcal{C}^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{j_0} u_{0,i}\varphi_i, \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} u_{0,i}\varphi_i \right\rangle_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} (\lambda_i^{-1}i^{-2\gamma})u_{0,i}^2 i^{2\gamma} \leq R\left((\lambda_{j_0}^{-1}j_0^{-2\gamma}) \wedge M_0\right)$$

for some $\infty > M_0 > 0$. The last inequality is true if we have either $\lambda_{j_0} j_0^{2\gamma}$ is increasing or decreasing monotonically. This shall be the case with our choice of prior. Next, for any operator K let us define $K|_S$ as the operator K restricted to the subset S. Also, let C_1^j be the linear span of $\{\varphi_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+2}....\}$. Note that $C_1^j \subset (D_1^{j/4})^c$

$$\|G(u_0) - h\|_2^2 = \left\| G \sum_{i>j_0} u_{0,i}\varphi_i \right\|_2^2 \leq \left\| G|_{C_1^{j_0}} \right\|^2 \left\| \sum_{i>j_0} u_{0,i}\varphi_i \right\|_1^2 \leq \left\| G|_{(D_1^{j_0/4})^c} \right\|^2 j_0^{-2\gamma} \left(\sum_{i>j_0} u_{0,i}^2 i^{2\gamma} \right)$$

Hence, we have

$$\|G(u_0) - h\|_2^2 \leq R\rho_{j_0/4}^2 j_0^{-2\gamma}$$

We thus see that the relevant estimates are equivalent to the corresponding estimates in the diagonal case with $u_0' = \sum u_{0,i} e_i$. Hence, we get ϵ_n which are equivalent to the diagonal case. Furthermore, we get the same k_n and ξ_n which satisfy the Assumption 3.11. Thus, $\left(\frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n}\right)^2 \approx n^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+2\delta+1}}$, which together with equation (30) shows that Assumption 3.12 is satisfied.

To be precise, let us assume that G satisfies condition 3 and $\mathcal{C}$ has eigenvalues $\{(1+k^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta})\}$. This will give $\epsilon_n \approx n^{-\frac{\alpha+\gamma\wedge\delta}{2\alpha+2\delta+1}}$. As in [19], we can check that $\xi_n \approx n^{-\frac{\gamma\wedge\delta}{2\alpha+2\delta+1}}$ and $k_n \approx n^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+2\delta+1}}$. Note here that for $\gamma < \delta$, the choice of k_n in [19] is different from ours, and it does not satisfy relevant assumptions.

Our next example is based around examples discussed in [2]. We consider the noise to be colored. Before we begin the analysis, we shall note two results from functional analysis.

Theorem 4.4.

- *$(\mathcal{I} + GK)^{-1}$ is continuous for continuous G and K when G is positive definite and K is positive. Proof is outlined in the last part of Lemma 8.6 of [2],*
- *$\|G^p(x)\|^q \geq \|G^q(x)\|^p$ for $p \geq q > 0$ whenever G or G^{-1} is positive definite, compact and self adjoint. The result can be readily proved by Jensen's inequality.*

Example 4.5. *For this class of examples, we have $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{H}$. The choice of G in [2] is such that G is compact, self-adjoint and positive definite. Let the covariance operator of noise be $\zeta \equiv (G^{-r} + K_1)^{-2}$ for $r \in (0,1)$, and K_1 be a continuous, self-adjoint and positive operator on $\mathcal{H}$. We shall reserve our choice of prior for now. Note that if we choose our prior to be of similar form as ζ, our class of examples will be of the type of examples in [2]. We shall begin with estimating $\mu_0\{u : \|G(u) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta \leq \epsilon\}$. Note that $\zeta^{-1/2}G = (\mathcal{I} + K_1 G^r)G^{-r+1}$. Then writing $\|(\mathcal{I} + K_1 G^r\| = R_1$ observe that*

$$\{u : \left(G^{-r+1}u \leq \epsilon\right) \subset \{u : \left(\mathcal{I} + K_1 G^r\right)G^{-r+1}u \leq R_1\epsilon)\}$$

Hence a lower bound for $\mu_0\{u : \left\|G^{-r+1}(u - u_0)\right\| \leq K\epsilon\}$ will also be a lower bound for $\mu_0\{u : \|G(u) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta \leq \epsilon\}$. Therefore, it suffices to find a sequence ϵ_n for the operator G^{-r+1} instead of the operator $\zeta^{-1/2}G$. The computations involved in finding such $\{\epsilon_n\}$ will depend on the choice of our prior μ_0. For the sake of definiteness, we shall pick a Gaussian prior with covariance $\mathcal{C} \equiv \left(G^{-t} + K_2\right)^{-l}$ for $t > (1-r)$ and $l \leq 2$, such that $\mathcal{C}$ has the eigenbasis $\{\varphi_j\}$, and K_2 above is a continuous, self adjoint and positive operator. We choose μ_0' with covariance operator G^{lt}. As in the previous example and discussion before that, we take ν and ν' to be the pushforwards of μ_0 and μ_0' via G^{-r+1}, respectively. The measures ν and ν' have covariance operators $G^{-r+1}\left(G^{-t} + K_2\right)^{-l} G^{-r+1}$ and $G^{lt+2-2r}$ with eigenvalues $\{\alpha_j\}$ and $\{\beta_j\}$, respectively. We now show that these operators satisfy Assumption 4.1. For the first part of the assumption, we apply the Min-max Theorem 4.2. For the sake of calculations below, let the eigenpairs of G be $\{e_j, \lambda_j\}$ with $\lambda_j \geq \lambda_{j+1}$. Further, let D_j be the span of $\{e_1, e_2.....e_j\}$. Also, note that $\left(G^{-t} + K_2\right)^{-l} = \left(\mathcal{I} + G^t K_2\right)^{-l} G^t$, which is compact, self adjoint and positive. Hence, all exponents of the operator are well defined. Then, by the second part of Theorem

4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_j &= \min_{\{S:codimS=j-1\}} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1,x\in S\}} \langle G^{-r+1}\left(G^{-t}+K_2\right)^{-l} G^{-r+1}x, x\rangle \\
&\leq \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1,x\in D_j\}} \frac{\langle (G^{-t}+K_2)^{-l} G^{-r+1}x, G^{-r+1}x\rangle}{\langle G^{-r+1}x, G^{-r+1}x\rangle} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1,x\in D_j\}} \langle G^{-2r+2}x, x\rangle \\
&= \lambda_j^{2-2r} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1,x\in D_j\}} \left\langle \left(\left(G^{-t}+K_2\right)^{-1}\right)^l x, x\right\rangle \\
&= \lambda_j^{2-2r} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1,x\in D_j\}} \left\| \left(\left(G^{-t}+K_2\right)^{-1}\right)^{l/2} x\right\|^2 \\
&\leq \lambda_j^{2-2r} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1,x\in D_j\}} \left\| \left(\left(G^{-t}+K_2\right)^{-1}\right) x\right\|^l \qquad \textit{(by Theorem 4.4 and } l\leq 2\textit{)} \\
&= \lambda_j^{2-2r} \max_{\{x:\|x\|=1,x\in D_j\}} \left\| \left(\mathcal{I}+G^tK_2\right)^{-1} G^t x\right\|^l \\
&\leq \lambda_j^{2-2r} \left\| \left(\mathcal{I}+G^tK_2\right)^{-1}\right\|^l \left\| G^t|_{D_j}\right\|^l \\
&\leq C_1\beta_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, applying the fourth part of Theorem 4.2, we see that $1/\alpha_j \leq C_2/\beta_j$. *Note here that we can show that eigenvalues of* $\mathcal{C}$ *are of the order of* λ_j^{lt}. *Now, we move to checking the second condition of Assumption 4.1. Take* $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\gamma(\mathcal{C})$ *and let* $\sum_i \left(\frac{\langle u_0,\varphi_i\rangle}{i^\gamma}\right)^2 = R$.

Let $u_0 = \sum_i u_i\varphi_i$, *then we take* $h = \sum_{i=1}^{j_0} u_i G^{1-r}(\varphi_i)$ *for some* $j_0 > 0$, *which will be determined later. Like in the previous example, we then estimate the Cameron-Martin norm of* h *under the measure* ν. *Like before, we shall assume that* $j_0^{2\gamma}\lambda_{j_0}^{lt}$ *is either increasing, or decreasing monotonically.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h\|_\nu^2 &= \| \left(G^{-r+1}\mathcal{C}G^{-r+1}\right)^{-1/2} h\|^2 \\
&= \left\langle G^{r-1}\mathcal{C}^{-1}G^{r-1}h, h\right\rangle \\
&= \|\mathcal{C}^{-1/2}G^{r-1}h\|^2 \\
&\leq K\sum_{j=1}^{j_0} \frac{u_j^2}{\lambda_j^{lt}} \\
&\leq K\ R\ \left(\left(\frac{j_0^{-2\gamma}}{\lambda_{j_0}^{lt}}\right)\wedge M_0\right) \\
&\leq K\ R\ \left(\left(\frac{j_0^{-\frac{2\gamma(1-r)}{t}}}{\lambda_{j_0}^{lt}}\right)\wedge M_0\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for some $M_0 \in (0,\infty)$. *We now estimate* $\|h - G^{1-r}u_0\|$. *Note that* $\|G^{1-r}h\| = \| \left(\left(\mathcal{C}^{-1/l}-K_2\right)^{-1}\right)^{\frac{1-r}{t}} x\| \leq \| \left(\mathcal{C}^{-1/l}-K_2\right)^{-1} x\|^{\frac{1-r}{t}}$. *The last inequality is true because of Theorem 4.4 and the fact that* $t \geq (1-r)$. *Next, writing* $M = \|\mathcal{I}+G^tK_2\| = \|(\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{t}}K_2)^{-1}\|$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h - G^{1-r}u_0\| &= \|G^{1-r}\sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} u_j\varphi_j\| \\
&\leq \| \left(\mathcal{C}^{-1/l}-K_2\right)^{-1} \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} u_j\varphi_j\|^{\frac{1-r}{t}} \\
&\leq (MR)^{\frac{1-r}{t}} j_0^{-\frac{\gamma(1-r)}{t}} \lambda_{j_0}^{1-r}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get the same estimates for $\{\epsilon_n\}$ as in the diagonal case for white noise with $G' = G^{1-r}$ and $u_0' \in \mathcal{H}^{\frac{\gamma(1-r)}{t}}$ [[19] Section 3.2]. Given $\{\epsilon_n\}$ and choice of Gaussian prior, Assumption 3.11 can be verified for ξ_n and appropriate k_n as in diagonal case. If this $\{\xi_n\}$ is the contraction rate, we need to satisfy Assumption 3.12. we need to show that $g_{k_n} \leq C_1(\frac{\xi_n}{\epsilon_n})^2$. Given the prior, we know the values of ξ_n and ϵ_n in the diagonal case [19]. Hence, the above inequality is equivalent to proving $g_n \leq \frac{C_1}{\rho_n^2}$ where ρ_n is the nth largest eigenvalue of G^{-r+1}. Below, we try to estimate g_n. For $h \in span\{\varphi_1, .., \varphi_n\} = D_n$, $S_1 = \|(\mathcal{I} + G^r K_1)^{-1}\|$ and $S_2 = \|(\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{C}^{\frac{1}{t}} K_2)\|$, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\zeta^{1/2} G^{-1} h\| &= \|(\mathcal{I} + G^r K_1)^{-1} G^{r-1} h\| \\
&= \|(\mathcal{I} + G^r K_1)^{-1} (\mathcal{C}^{-1/l} - K_2)^{\frac{1-r}{t}} h\| \\
&\leq S_1 S_2^{\frac{1-r}{t}} \|\mathcal{C}^{-1/l} h\|^{\frac{1-r}{t}} \\
&\leq S_1 S_2^{\frac{1-r}{t}} \lambda_n^{r-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, Assumption 3.12 is satisfied and hence ξ_n is the contraction rate for the inverse problem. To be exact, if G satisfied condition 3 and $\mathcal{C}$ has eigenvalues $\{(1+k^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta}\}$ then the contraction rate is $\xi_n = n^{-\frac{\gamma' \wedge \delta}{2\alpha + 2\delta + 1}}$ where $\gamma' = \gamma(1-r)/t$. Note that we can do the above computations for the choice of operators made by Agapiou[2] with a mild assumption. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the prior, $\zeta \equiv (\mathcal{C}^{-r} + K_1)^{-2}$ the noise and $G \equiv (\mathcal{C}^{-l} + K_2)^{-1}$ the operator to be inverted. Assume that $l > r$. As before, this assumption allows us to write the posterior as a density of the prior. We can redo the entire analysis with these operators. Also notice that in this case, we shall get $\gamma' = \gamma$ and hence will get the same rate of contraction as in the diagonal case with prior $\mathcal{C}$ and linear operator $G = \mathcal{C}^{l-r}$.

Our third example will involve another way in which we can satisfy Assumption 4.1.

Example 4.6. *In this example, we shall take the noise to be white. Let the eigenpair corresponding to μ_0 be $\{\varphi_j, \lambda_j\}$ and that it is absolutely continuous with respect to the measure μ_0' with eigenpair $\{e_j, \lambda_j\}$. Note that $\{e_j\}$ are eigenvectors of $G^T G$. Let ν and ν' be the pushforward of μ_0 and μ_0' via G respectively. Then ν and ν' are absolutely continuous with respect to each other and will satisfy Assumption 4.1. Further, we can check that the contraction rates here shall be the same as in diagonal case. Next, we shall explicitly check when μ_0 and μ_0' are absolutely continuous with respect to each other.*

The Gaussian measures μ_0 and μ_0' are absolutely continuous with respect to each other if $S = \left(I - G_1^{-1/2} R G_1^{-1/2}\right)$ is Hilbert-Schmidt, where R is the covariance operator of μ_0 and G_1 is the covariance operator of μ_0'. Further, we see that $R = T^{-1} G_1 T$, for some orthogonal operator T. Hence, whether or not S is Hilbert-Schmidt depends only on T and $\{\lambda_j\}$. Further, if Assumption 3.12 is satisfied, we have the rates for this setup. Hence, we need the following assumption.

Assumption 4.7.

- *$S = \left(I - G_1^{-1/2} R G_1^{-1/2}\right)$ is Hilbert-Schmidt, where R and G_1 are the covariance operator of μ and μ' respectively.*
- *$g_n \leq C_1/\rho_n^2$, where ρ_n^2 is the n-th largest eigenvalue of $G^T G$.*

Clearly, any finite dimensional rotation (that is $e_i = \varphi_i$ except for finitely many indices i) satisfy the above assumption. Note that the subgroup of finite dimensional rotations is dense in the group $U(\mathcal{H}_1)$ in strong operator topology. Instead of the second condition in 4.7, we shall instead use a stronger condition which has a form similar to the first condition. Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ be operators with eigenpairs $\{e_j, \rho_j^2\}$ and $\{\varphi_j, \rho_j^2\}$ respectively.

Lemma 4.8. *$\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{C}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_2 \mathcal{C}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is Hilbert Schmidt $\implies$ $g_n \leq C_1/\rho_n^2$.*

Proof. $\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{C}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_2 \mathcal{C}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is Hilbert Schmidt and self adjoint $\implies$ $\mathcal{C}_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{C}_2^{-1} \mathcal{C}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is continuous. This implies, that for some fixed $K > 0$ and any $h = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \varphi_j$, we have $\frac{K}{\sum_{j=1}^n (\rho_j x_j)^2} \geq \|\mathcal{C}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \rho_j x_j \varphi_j}{(\sum_{j=1}^n (\rho_j x_j)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\|$. Hence, $g_n \leq K/\rho_n^2$. □

We will now get to specific examples in which μ and μ' are absolutely continuous with respect to each other.

First, we try reflections. Let P be the hyperplane perpendicular to the unit vector $v = \sum v_i e_i$. The second basis (say φ_i) is formed by reflecting e_i along P. Let this reflection be our unitary transform U.

$$U(x) = x - 2\langle x, v\rangle v$$

Then we have $R = UGU$, since $U^2 = I$. Now, we need to see for what values of v (that is $\{v_i\}$) is the operator $\left(I - G^{-1/2}RG^{-1/2}\right)$ Hilbert Schmidt.

Observe that

$$I - G^{-1/2}RG^{-1/2} = I - G^{-1/2}UGUG^{-1/2} = A + A^T - AA^T$$

Where $A = 2G^{-1/2}SG^{1/2}$, and $S(x) = \langle x, v\rangle v$. Therefore, if A is Hilbert Schmidt, then so is A^T and AA^T and our required condition is satisfied.

$$\sum_i \langle Ae_i, Ae_i\rangle = \sum_i (\lambda_i v_i)^2 \left(\sum_j \left(\frac{v_j}{\lambda_j}\right)^2\right)$$

Hence, we have our desired result if v is such that $\left(\sum_j \left(\frac{v_j}{\lambda_j}\right)^2\right) < \infty$. Similarly, for the second condition in Assumption 4.7, we have $\left(\sum_j \left(\frac{v_j}{\rho_j^2}\right)^2\right) < \infty$.

We now try operators of type $\exp(A)$ where A is an operator satisfying $A = -A^T$ (lets call them skewsymmetric operators as in finite dimensions) and $\exp(A) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^i}{i!}$. Here, we shall try to get conditions on A so that $\left(I - R^{-1/2}\exp(A)R\exp(-A)R^{-1/2}\right)$ is trace class. Using Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula, followed by induction (we use invariance of trace under cyclic permutation), we have

$$trace\left(I - R^{-1/2}\exp(tA)R\exp(-tA)R^{-1/2}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} trace\left(\left(B + B^T\right)^i\right),$$

where, $B = R^{1/2}AR^{-1/2}$. Hence it is sufficient to check that $\left(B + B^T\right)$ is trace class. For the second condition in Assumption 4.7, we have the same result with R replaced by $\mathcal{C}_2$.

Appendix A. Appendix

In this appendix, we prove that in finite dimensions when $G : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ is linear and injective with $q \geq p$, the contraction rate is $\sqrt{(\log n)/n}$. We will work with a general centered Gaussian noise measure on $\mathbb{R}^q$, i.e., in this example the distribution of η will be $\mu_\zeta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \zeta)$ where ζ is the covariance matrix of μ_ζ. The prior on $\mathbb{R}^p$ is μ_0 which need not be Gaussian but satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption A.1.

- *Let $u, u_0 \in R^p$, $r > 0$. Then we have, for some $s > 0$ and $F_{u_0} > 0$, $\mu_0\{u : \|u - u_0\| \leq r\} \geq F_{u_0} r^s$.*
- *μ_0 is equivalent(mutually absolutely continuous) to $\mu_{0,r}$ where $\|r\| < \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $\mu_{0,r}$ is μ_0 translated by r. Also, $M_2 > \frac{d\mu_{0,r}}{d\mu_0}(u) > M_1$ on $\{r : \|r\| < \epsilon\} \times K$ where K is any compact set in R^p for $M_1, M_2 > 0$.*

With this, it is easy to see that the posterior measure μ_n^y is given by

$$\mu_n^y(A) = \frac{1}{Z_n^y} \int_A \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2}\|G(u) - y\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0\,.$$

The norm in the integrand is the Cameron Martin norm on $\mathbb{R}^q$ corresponding to the measure μ_ζ and Z_n^y is the normalising constant given by

$$Z_n^y = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2}\|G(u) - y\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0$$

Now let y' be the projection of y onto $G(\mathbb{R}^p)$ with respect to the Cameron Martin inner product induced by μ_ζ, and let u' be the unique element in $\mathbb{R}^p$ such that $y' = G(u')$. Since $\|G(u)-y\|_\zeta^2 = \|G(u)-y'\|_\zeta^2 + \|y'-y\|_\zeta^2$, it is easy to see that

$$\mu_n^y(A) = \frac{1}{Z_n^{y'}} \int_A \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2}\|G(u-u')\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0$$

Where $Z_n^{y'} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(u-u')\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0$. This is the form of the posterior that we shall be using in this proof.

Define the sets $S_n = \{u : \|u-u_0\| > \xi_n\}$ and let us denote by $\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}$ the expectation w.r.t. the measure $\mathbb{R}^q$ generated by the random variable $G(u_0) + \zeta/\sqrt{n}$. It would be sufficient for a sequence $\{\xi_n\}$ to be the contraction rate if $f_n := \mathbb{Q}_{0,n}\left(\mu_n^y(S_n)\right) \to 0$.

Defining $R_n := \{y : \|y - G(u_0)\|_\zeta \le r_n\}$ to be balls of radius r_n (where the sequence r_n will be chosen later appropriately), we write the required expectation as a sum of two terms:

$$\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}\left(\mu_n^y(S_n)\right) = \mathbb{Q}_{0,n}\left[\mathbb{I}_{R_n}(y)\mu_n^y(S_n)\right] + \mathbb{Q}_{0,n}\left[\mathbb{I}_{R_n^c}(y)\mu_n^y(S_n)\right] \tag{31}$$

For the second term in RHS, we have

$$\mathbb{Q}_{0,n}\left(\mathbb{I}_{R_n^c}(y)\mu_n^y(S_n)\right) \le \mathbb{Q}_{0,n}\left(\mathbb{I}_{R_n^c}(y)\right) = \int_{R_n^c} exp\left(-\frac{n}{2}\|y-G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0$$

Now, since R_n is the complement of a ball centered at $G(u_0)$, it is clear that the above integral goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$ if we choose $r_n = f_n/\sqrt{n}$ for any $f_n \to \infty$.

To deal with the first term in equation (31), we need the following lemma.

Claim A.2. *There exist K_1, K_2 such that for y satisfying $\|y - G(u_0)\| < K_1\xi_n$, we have $\mu_n^y(S_n) \le K_2\mu_n^{G(u_0)}(S_n')$ where $S_n' = \{u : \|u-u_0\| > \xi_n/2\}$ for sufficiently small ξ_n.*

Assuming we have this result, the first term is now bounded by $K_2\mu_n^{G(u_0)}(S_n')$ if $r_n \le K_1\xi_n$. So, we need ξ_n such that $\mu_n^{G(u_0)}\{u : \|u-u_0\| > \xi_n/2\} \to 0$ and $\xi_n > f_n/\sqrt{n}$ for some $f_n \to \infty$. Such $\{\xi_n\}$ is a contraction rate for the posterior. We now proceed to estimate $\mu_n^{G(u_0)}(S_n')$ by noting that

$$\mu_n^{G(u_0)}\{u : \|u-u_0\| > \xi_n/2\} = \frac{\int_{\{u:\|u-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}} \exp\left(-n\|G(u)-G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(u)-G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0}. \tag{32}$$

We estimate the numerator first. G^{-1} is Lipshitz and say its Lipshitz constant is K_3 where norms are taken in the usual norm for $\mathbb{R}^p$ and Cameron Martin norm of μ_ζ for $\mathbb{R}^q$. Hence $\|u-u_0\| > \xi_n/2$ implies $\|G(u)-G(u_0)\|_\zeta > \xi_n/2K_3$

$$\int_{\{u:\|u-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}} \exp\left(-n\|G(u)-G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0 \le \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2}(\xi_n/2K_3)^2\right)$$

Also, let K_4 be the Lipshitz constant for G. Then, for the denominator of equation (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(u)-G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0 &\ge \int_{\|u-u_0\| \le \frac{1}{4K_3K_4}\xi_n} \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2}\|G(u-u_0)\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0 \\
&\ge \exp(-\frac{n}{2}(\xi_n/4K_3)^2)\mu_0\{u : \|u-u_0\| \le \frac{1}{4K_3K_4}\xi_n\} \\
&\ge \exp(-\frac{n}{2}(\xi_n/4K_3)^2)F_{u_0}(\frac{1}{4K_3K_4}\xi_n)^s.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we have used the first part of Assumption A.1. With this, we can show that for some constants L and M,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_n^{G(u_0)}\{u : \|u-u_0\| > \xi_n/2\} &\le \frac{\exp(-\frac{n}{2}(\xi_n/4K_3)^2)}{F_{u_0}(\frac{1}{4K_3K_4}\xi_n)^s} \\
&\le \exp -(Ln\xi_n^2 + M\log\xi_n)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the choice $\xi_n = \sqrt{(\log n)/n}$ suffices as a rate of contraction.

Now, to complete the proof, we need to prove the claim A.2.

Proof of Lemma A.2. We have

$$\mu_n^y(S_n) = \frac{\int_{S_n} \exp\left(-n\|G(u) - G(u')\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(u) - G(u')\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0}$$

Where $G(u')$ is the projection of y on $G(\mathbb{R}^p)$. Now, we make the change of variable $x = u - (u' - u_0)$. This leads to

$$\mu_n^y(S_n) = \frac{\int_{\{x:\|x+u'-2u_0\|>\xi_n\}} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0}$$

Here, $g_{u'}(x)$ is the density of the prior μ_0 translated by $u' - u_0$ wrt to the prior μ_0. For ξ_n sufficiently small, $g_{u'}(x)$ exists and is uniformly bounded in u' for compact sets in x above and below(with positive lower bound) by the second part of Assumption A.1.

Take $K_1 = 1/2K_3$ where K_3 is the Lipshitz constant of G^{-1}. Then $\|y - G(u_0)\| < K_1\xi_n$ implies $\|y' - G(u_0)\| < K_1\xi_n$ and hence $\|u' - u_0\| < \xi_n/2$. For u' satisfying this property, we have $\{x : \|x + u' - 2u_0\| > \xi_n\} \subset \{x : \|x - u_0\| > \xi_n/2\}$. This gives

$$\mu_n^y(S_n) \leq \frac{\int_{\{x:\|x-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0}$$

We also have

$$\mu_n^{G(u_0)}(S_n') = \frac{\int_{\{x:\|x-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}} \exp\left(-n/2\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n/2\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2\right) d\mu_0}$$

Lets fix the following notation.

$$N^y = \int_{\{x:\|x-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0$$

$$N^{G(u_0)} = \int_{\{x:\|x-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0$$

$$Z^y = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0$$

$$Z^{G(u_0)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0$$

We shall be done if we show $N^y \leq K_5 N^{G(u_0)}$ and $Z^y \geq K_6 Z^{G(u_0)}$ for some constants K_5 and K_6. To this end, we will first show that the above inequalities hold when the integrals concerned are done on a compact ball chosen independently from u'. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\|u' - u_0\| \leq 1$. Further we define the following quantities.

$$N_r^y = \int_{\{x:\|x-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}\cap B(u_0,r)} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0$$

$$N_r^{G(u_0)} = \int_{\{x:\|x-u_0\|>\xi_n/2\}\cap B(u_0,r)} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0$$

$$Z_r^y = \int_{B(u_0,r)} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) g_{u'}(x) d\mu_0$$

$$Z_r^{G(u_0)} = \int_{B(u_0,r)} \exp\left(-n\|G(x) - G(u_0)\|_\zeta^2/2\right) d\mu_0$$

Since, $g(u')$ is uniformly bounded(for u' in a compact set as in our case) above and below(above 0) on compact sets, we have

$$Z_r^y \geq \left(\inf_{x \in B(u_0,r)} g_{u'}(x) \right) Z_r^{G(u_0)} = K_7(r) Z_r^{G(u_0)}$$

$$N_r^y \leq \left(\sup_{x \in B(u_0,r)} g_{u'}(x) \right) Z_r^{G(u_0)} = K_8(r) Z_r^{G(u_0)}$$

Now, if we could find a fixed r independent of u'(in unit ball around u_0) such that $N^y \leq C_1 N_r^y$ and $Z^{G(u_0)} \leq C_2 Z_r^{G(u_0)}$, we would be done. We show the result for N^y. The case for $N^{G(u_0)}$ is exactly the same.

Now, fix $r = 1$. We will now show that for large n, $2N_1^y \geq N^y$ and this will prove the claim. From the form of N^y, it is clear that, for some S, for large n

$$N_1^y \geq N^y_{\frac{1}{2K_3K_4}} \geq S \exp\left(-\frac{n}{8K_3^2}\right)$$

which gives

$$N^y - N_1^y = (N_1^y)^C \leq \exp\left(-\frac{n}{2K_3^2}\right) \leq N_1^y \,.$$

Hence, we have finally proven the claim A.2. □

References

[1] R. J. Adler and J. E. Taylor. *Random fields and geometry*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2007.

[2] S. Agapiou, S. Larsson, and A. M. Stuart. Posterior contraction rates for the Bayesian approach to linear ill-posed inverse problems. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 123(10):3828–3860, 2013.

[3] S. Agapiou, A. M. Stuart, and Y.-X. Zhang. Bayesian posterior contraction rates for linear severely ill-posed inverse problems. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 22(3):297–321, 2014.

[4] L. D. Brown and M. G. Low. Asymptotic equivalence of nonparametric regression and white noise. *Ann. Statist.*, 24(6):2384–2398, 1996.

[5] L. Cavalier. Nonparametric statistical inverse problems. *Inverse Problems*, 24(3):034004, 2008.

[6] M. Dashti and A. M. Stuart. Bayesian approach to inverse problems, 2014.

[7] J.-P. Florens and A. Simoni. Regularized posteriors in linear ill-posed inverse problems. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 39(2):214–235, 2012.

[8] J.-P. Florens and A. Simoni. Regularizing priors for linear inverse problems. *Econometric Theory*, FirstView:1–51, 11 2014.

[9] S. Ghosal, J. K. Ghosh, and A. W. van der Vaart. Convergence rates of posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, 28(2):500–531, 2000.

[10] E. Giné and R. Nickl. Rates of contraction for posterior distributions in L^r-metrics, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. *Ann. Statist.*, 39(6):2883–2911, 2011.

[11] T. Helin and M. Lassas. Hierarchical models in statistical inverse problems and the Mumford-Shah functional. *Inverse Problems*, 27(1):015008, 32, 2011.

[12] J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen, L. A. Shepp, and R. M. Dudley. On the lower tail of Gaussian seminorms. In *Selected works of R. M. Dudley*, Sel. Works Probab. Stat., pages 225–248. Springer, New York, 2010.

[13] J. Kaipio and E. Somersalo. Statistical inverse problems: discretization, model reduction and inverse crimes. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 198(2):493–504, 2007.

[14] A. Kirsch. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of inverse problems*, volume 120 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011.

[15] B. T. Knapik, A. W. van der Vaart, and J. H. van Zanten. Bayesian inverse problems with Gaussian priors. *Ann. Statist.*, 39(5):2626–2657, 2011.

[16] B. T. Knapik, A. W. van der Vaart, and J. H. van Zanten. Bayesian recovery of the initial condition for the heat equation. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods*, 42(7):1294–1313, 2013.

[17] H. Kuo. *Gaussian measure on Banach spaces, Lecture notes*, volume 463 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 1975.

[18] B. Locker. Doob at lyon: On his lecture, application of the theory of martingales, at the lyon colloquium, june 28 july 3, 1948. *Electronic J. History Probab. Statist*, 5(1):1–25, 2009.

[19] K. Ray. Bayesian inverse problems with non-conjugate priors. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 7:2516–2549, 2013.

[20] A. M. Stuart. Inverse problems: a Bayesian perspective. *Acta Numer.*, 19:451–559, 2010.

TIFR Centre for Applicable Mathematics, Post Bag No. 6503, GKVK Post Office, Bangalore-560065, India
E-mail address: madhuresh@math.tifrbng.res.in

TIFR Centre for Applicable Mathematics, Post Bag No. 6503, GKVK Post Office, Bangalore-560065, India
E-mail address: sreekar@math.tifrbng.res.in

International Centre for Theoretical Sciences - TIFR, IISc Campus, Bangalore-560012, India
E-mail address: apte@icts.res.in